

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Application No.:	09/977,112	Confirmation No.:	91734
Filing Date:	October 11, 2001	TC/A.U.:	2617
Customer No.:	54406	Examiner:	Wayne Huu Cai
Docket No.:	CISCP715	Applicant:	Greg Mercurio
Title:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ADDING EDITABLE INFORMATION TO RECORDS ASSOCIATED WITH A TRANSCIEVER DEVICE		

Commissioner for Patents
POB 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Appeal Brief

Sir:

Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Cisco Technology, Inc., the assignee of the present patent application and employer of the applicant/inventor.

Related Appeals and Interferences

None.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending and stand rejected. All pending claims 1-29 are appealed.

Status of Amendments

A response, Amendment E (After Final), was filed August 2, 2006 subsequent to the final rejection of pending claims 1-29 in the Office Action of June 2, 2006. The response elicited an Advisory Action mailed September 1, 2006 in which no amendments to the claims was accepted. In fact, besides substantive arguments against the rejection of claims, Amendment E attempted only to correct a typographical error in the specification.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The present invention is related to the operation and elements of an access point of a network. Access points, i.e., wireless transceiver devices more generally, allow the network to communicate wirelessly with a roaming device. Data related to the transactions, such as the time and length of the transaction, between an access point and roaming device are typically recorded. The present invention is directed toward providing customizable information which does not generally change during the operation of the access point, such as the physical location of the access point, to the transaction records.

Independent claims 1, 7, 17, 24, and 29 cover different aspects of the present invention. The citations below to specific and exemplary portions of the specification and drawings should help determine where the claimed subject matter is described in the application, but each claim might be best understood in the context of the specification and the drawings as a whole.

Claim 1 calls for a wireless transceiver device which interfaces with a roaming device (Fig. 2, access point 202). The wireless transceiver device has computer code for causing static input information (p. 4, p. 7, lines 26 - p. 8, line 6) associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted (p. 4, lines 26-27; p. 8, lines 18-28); a memory arranged to store data (p. 9, lines 1-10; Fig. 2, database 226), the memory further including an editable field (p. 9, lines 1-2; Fig. 2, field 222), wherein the computer code for causing the static input information to be accepted causes the static input information to be stored in the editable field (p. 4, lines 27-29; p. 9, lines 1-2); computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated (p. 4, line 30 - p. 5, line 1; p. 9, lines 6-21), the record being arranged to include the static input information stored in the editable field and the data (p. 4, lines 1-2; p. 9, lines 15-17), wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated further causes the record to be stored on the memory (p. 4, lines 2-3; p. 9, lines 17-21); and a processor for executing the computer codes (p. 9, lines 11-15; Fig. 2, processor 230), wherein the memory is further arranged to store the computer codes ().

Claim 7 calls for a wireless transceiver device which comprises: means for accepting input information associated with the wireless transceiver device (p. 7, lines 26 - p. 8, line 6; p. 8, lines 18-20); means for storing data, the means for storing the data further including means for storing the input information in an editable field, wherein the means for accepting the input

information includes means for providing the input information to the editable field (p. 9, lines 1-6); and means for generating a record associated with the first device, the record being arranged to include the input information stored in the editable field, wherein the means for storing the data further includes means for storing the record (p. 9, lines 11-21).

Claim 17 calls for a method of utilizing a transceiver device. The method comprises the steps of receiving static information (p. 7, lines 26 - 28) into an editable field stored in memory associated with the transceiver device, the static information being information pertaining to the transceiver device (p. 7, line 29 - p. 8, line 6; p. 8, lines 22-28); storing the static information into the editable field (p. 7, line 29 - p. 8, line 1; p. 9, lines 1-2); receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range of the transceiver device (p. 10, lines 19-27; Fig. 4, process 400); creating a record, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device (p. 9, lines 6-19; p. 11, lines 4-10; Fig. 4, steps 408 and 412); adding the static information into the record (p. 9, lines 15-17; p. 11, lines 10-12; Fig. 4, steps 408 and 412)); and storing the record in the memory (p. 9, lines 17-19; p. 12, lines 11-13).

Claim 24 calls for a method of configuring a network access point for use. The method has the steps: positioning the access point at a desired location (p. 9, lines 28-29; Fig. 3, step 304); determining an address of the desired location (p. 10, lines 1-6; Fig. 3, step 312); and storing the address in a memory field, the memory field being associated with the access point (p. 10, lines 8-15; Fig. 3, step 316).

Claim 29 calls for a method of using a network access point. The method comprising: receiving static information (p. 7, lines 26-28) into an editable field stored in a memory of the access point, the static information being information pertaining to the access point (p. 7, line 29 - p. 8, line 6; p. 8, lines 22-28, p. 11, lines 10-14; Fig. 4, step 404); storing the static information into the editable field (p. 7, line 29 - p. 8, line 1; p. 9, lines 1-2); receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range (p. 10, lines 19-27; Fig. 4, process 400); registering the roaming device after the indication is received (p. 10, lines 26-27; Fig. 4, step 404), wherein registering the roaming device includes performing a remote authentication (p. 11, lines 1-2); creating a record after registering the roaming device, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device (p. 11, lines 4-10; Fig. 4, steps 408 and

412); obtaining the static information from the editable field (p. 11, lines 10-14; Fig. 4, steps 408 and 412); adding the static information into the record (p. 9, lines 15-17; p. 11, lines 10-12; Fig. 4, steps 408 and 412); and storing the record in the memory (p. 9, lines 17-19; p. 12, lines 11-13).

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

I) Whether claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-17, 19-24, 27 and 28 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 6,539,393, which issued March 25, 2003 to S.J. Kabala (hereafter “Kabala”).

II) Whether claims 5 and 18 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kabala in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,452, which issued May 15, 2001 to K. Nishino (hereafter “Nishino”).

III) Whether claims 12, 15 and 26 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kabala in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,635, which issued July 2, 2002 to B.B. Stewart (hereafter “Stewart”).

IV) Whether claim 29 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kabala in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0164983, which was published on November 7, 2002, L.O. Raviv *et al.*, inventors (hereafter “Raviv”), and further in view of Stewart.

Arguments

The applicant directs his basic arguments against the rejection of his independent claims 1, 7, 17, 24 and 29 as most recently stated in the Final Office Action of June 2, 2006 and the Advisory Action of September 1, 2006. Specific arguments against the Advisory Action are made with respect to independent claim 1. These arguments are not repeated with respect to the other independent claims 7, 17, 24 and 29. Since the Examiner repeats his arguments with respect to claims 7, 17, 24 and 29 in the Advisory Action, the same arguments made by the applicant with respect to claim 1 apply to the Examiner’s repeated arguments in the Advisory Action.

I. The Examiner Has Not Made A *Prima Facie* Case of Anticipation in Rejecting Independent Claims 1, 7, 17 and 24

Independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,539,393 issued to S.J. Kabala (hereinafter “Kabala”). But for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the Patent Office requires that the cited reference teach every element of the claim, whether expressly or inherently described. See MPEP §2131. The Examiner has simply failed to meet this requirement to make a *prima facie* case of anticipation in her rejection of the applicant’s claims, which are organized below by independent claims.

1. Claims 1, 7 and their dependents

Claim 1 recites:

A wireless transceiver device, the wireless transceiver device being arranged to interface with a roaming device, the wireless transceiver device comprising:

- computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted;
- a memory arranged to store data, the memory further including an editable field, wherein the computer code for causing the static input information to be accepted causes the static input information to be stored in the editable field;
- computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated, the record being arranged to include the static input information stored in the editable field and the data, wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated further causes the record to be stored on the memory; and
- a processor for executing the computer codes, wherein the memory is further arranged to store the computer codes.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner stated:

Kabala discloses a wireless transceiver device (i.e., a plurality of portable transceiver[s]), the wireless transceiver device being arranged to interface with a roaming device (i.e., a plurality of badges), the wireless transceiver device comprising:

- computer code for causing static input information (i.e., transceiver's own identification codes, signal strength of the signals received from the badges) associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted (col. 4, lines 52-67);
- a memory arranged to store data (i.e., the central processor 110 inherently has a memory to store data), the memory further including an editable field, wherein the computer code for causing the static input information to be accepted causes the static input information to be stored in the

editable field (col. 4, lines 52-67);
computer code for causing a record associate[d] with the roaming device to be generate[d], the record being arranged to include the static input information stored in the editable field and data, wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated further causes the record to be stored on the memory (see fig. 5, and its descriptions. Also, the central processor 110 would have a memory to store collected data);

Also, it is inherent that a processor for executing the computer codes, wherein the memory is further arranged to store the computer codes.

With due respect to the Examiner, the Kabala reference does not disclose the invention recited in claim 1. As quoted above, the basis of the Examiner's rejection is the identification of one of the Kabala transceivers 151-162 with the applicant's claimed "wireless transceiver device," and one of the plurality of badges with the applicant's "roaming device." There are several flaws and contradictions in the rationale of the rejection.

First, in the cited portion of the Kabala reference, i.e., col. 4, lines 52-67, there is no description nor even a hint of "computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted." In the Advisory Action, the Examiner responded, "...the wireless transceiver device of the claimed invention is considered as the transceiver 151 -162 of Kabala, and the roaming device of the claimed invention is considered as the badges of Kabala. Therefore, any information of the badges and associated with any particular transceiver 151 -1 62 is accepted at the control processor 11 0 is broadly and reasonably considered as the static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted. The Applicant is respectfully invited to Figure 5, where the wireless transceiver device is identified as "Booth 190, and all the visitors, company, time in, time out, product A, and product B are static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted."

The applicant disagrees with this misreading of the claim language. The claim does not recite "any" information, but rather "static input information." Static information is described in the applicant's specification as "generally information which is not updated during the operation of the access point, until an individual such as a system administrator chooses to rewrite the static information with new static information." Page 7, lines 26-28. Static information does not

often change, if at all, during operation of the access point. Figure 5 of Kabala does not refer static input information, but rather dynamic input information during the operation of the transceiver for booth 190. This should be evident by the characterization of the information given by the Examiner himself.

Second, the Examiner identified the applicant's "memory arranged to store data" with memory associated in the central processor 110 (see Fig. 1) of the Kabala reference. The applicant points out that his claims follows standard patent practice, i.e., that the elements following the term, "comprising," mean that the elements are parts of the wireless transceiver device which precedes "comprising." To wit, "memory arranged to store data" is an element of the claimed wireless transceiver device in the preamble of claim 1. However, having identified the applicant's claimed "wireless transceiver device" with one of the Kabala transceivers 151-162, the Examiner now identifies a purported element of the transceivers 151-162 with the central processor 110. This is inconsistent and not logical. See Fig. 1 and note that the boxes labeled 151-162 around the periphery of the drawing are separate and distinct from the box labeled 110 at the center of the drawing.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner disagrees. "The Examiner respectfully disagrees...because it is the Examiner's position to give the broadest interpretation, and the Examiner indeed follows the standard patent practice as well. As stated by the Applicant, the elements following the term, "comprising," mean that the elements are parts of the wireless transceiver device which precedes "comprising." Therefore, the wireless transceiver device is one of the transceivers 151-162 of Kabala, and the memory arranged to store data located within the control processor 110 of Kabala are also part of the wireless device transceivers 151-162. Hence, the Examiner's interpretation is in accordance to the standard patent practice. The Examiner respectfully invites the Applicant to further amend claim to clarify and suggest to one skilled in the art that the present invention requires a memory arranged to store data is located within the wireless transceiver; otherwise, one skilled in the art would still conceptualize that the control processor 110 and memory located within the control processor 110 are parts of the wireless transceivers 151-162." Frankly, the applicant remains puzzled by this contradiction. When two elements in Kabala, "one of the transceivers 151-162" and "the control processor 110," are described and shown separately in Fig. 1, the "broadest interpretation" does not allow one to incorporate a constituent, "a memory", of the second element as a constituent of the first element.

Third, nowhere is there described nor mentioned in the portion cited in Kabala patent that a memory in the transceivers 151-162, or in the central processor 110, has “an editable field” and that the transceiver’s own identification codes stored in such an editable field. The applicant has been unable to find such a teaching in col. 4, lines 52-67 and respectfully requests that the Examiner quote such language for the applicant’s edification.

In the Advisory Action the Examiner responded, “...the Examiner reasonably and broadly interprets ‘editable field’ as collect, prepare, add-on field. Kabala clearly teaches or suggests that the wireless transceiver 151-162 are collecting all the visitors (i.e., badges information) and generating the listing of data. Hence, it is broadly considered the control processor 110 has an edible [sic] field to add on the listed as seen in Figure 5. See column 9, lines 3-17 of Kabala.” The language cited by the Examiner states:

FIG. 5 is an exemplary listing of the data generated by the system from the convention settings of FIGS. 1 and 1A. A listing of the visits by individuals at a particular booth is shown and the times at which the particular products viewed or visited as recorded by the system is shown. An archival data of the dates the persons visited, the company the person is from, the durations of visits, and the number of visits are examples of data which may be helpful for an exhibitor. The exhibitor can use the listing to identify the attendees having interest in which products. The listing includes the company and from which the attendees are from. Such information may be helpful in identifying potential purchasers and competitors. The operator of the convention or the trade show can employ the locator system to collect data and provide such data to exhibitors as a service and/or for fee.

The “editable field” is neither described nor implied. It is a creation by the Examiner’s “broad consideration.”

Fourth, nowhere is there described nor mentioned that any of the Kabala transceivers 151-162 have “computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated, the record being arranged to include the static input information stored in the editable field and the data, wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated further causes the record to be stored on the memory.” The portion cited by the Examiner states:

...transceivers 151 to 162 in each booth receives the identification code of the badge carried by the attendee. The identification information, along with the transceivers’ own identification codes, and the signal strength of the signals

received from the badges, are forwarded by the transceivers to the central processor 110....Then, the central processor retrieves the information entered by operators when the attendees registered for the show to archive a list having identity of the attendees, the places of booths visited, the times of the visits, and the durations of the visits. Col. 4, lines 52-67.

Not only is there no description of a computer code in the transceivers 151 to 162, but the transceivers do not generate a record associated with a roaming device. The transceivers 151 to 162 merely forward the information to the central processor 110.

In the Advisory Action the Examiner states the central processor 110 has records of visits by individuals as shown in Fig. 5 (and presumably, by implication, software to causing such records). As argued above with respect to patent practice and the use of the “comprising,” the central processor 110 is not, and cannot be, part of the claimed “wireless transceiver device,” however “broadly interpreted.” See MPEP §2131.

Fifth, assuming *arguendo* that the archived list generated by the central processor 110 is to identified with the applicant’s “record associated with the roaming device,” the so-called “record” does not include any static input information associated with a transceiver, as called for in claim 1. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner again confusing static information, described in the applicant’s specification as “generally information which is not updated during the operation of the access point, until an individual such as a system administrator chooses to rewrite the static information with new static information (Page 7, lines 26-28),” with the dynamic input information recorded during the operation of the transceiver for booth 190.

Finally, as pointed out above with respect to standard patent practice, claim 1 recites “a memory” and “a processor” as elements of the claimed “wireless transceiver device.” Having identified the applicant’s wireless transceiver device with one of Kabala’s transceivers 151 to 162, Examiner again contradicts himself by identifying the claimed processor with the central processor 110. The putative “wireless transceiver device,” one of the Kabala transceivers 151-162, is not the same as the central processor 110. The Examiner continues to maintain that the “the control processor 110, memory, and processor would be still part of the wireless transceivers 151 -162” in his Advisory Action.

As argued above, the Examiner's loose interpretation of the teachings of the Kabala patent is contrary to standard patent practice.

Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 1. It is not anticipated by the cited Kabala patent and should be allowable. Likewise, dependent claims 2-6 should be allowable for at least being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Furthermore, at least some of the dependent claims should be allowable in their own right.

Independent claim 7 recites:

A wireless transceiver device, the wireless transceiver device being arranged to interface with a first device, the transceiver device comprising:
means for accepting input information associated with the wireless transceiver device;
means for storing data, the means for storing the data further including means for storing the input information in an editable field, wherein the means for accepting the input information includes means for providing the input information to the editable field; and
means for generating a record associated with the first device, the record being arranged to include the input information stored in the editable field, wherein the means for storing the data further includes means for storing the record.

With similar limitations as recited in independent claim 1, claim 7 should be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, each of the claims 8-16, which depend from claim 7, should be allowable over the cited art for at least being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Furthermore, at least some, if not all, of these dependent claims recites additional limitations, which when considered in light of claim 7, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

2. Claim 17 and its dependents

Independent claim 17 recites a method for utilizing a wireless transceiver device that includes similar limitations to those recited in independent claim 1. Claim 17 recites:

A method for utilizing a transceiver device, the transceiver device being a wireless transceiver device, the transceiver device having a communications range, the method comprising:

receiving static information into an editable field stored in memory associated with the transceiver device, the static information being information pertaining to the transceiver device;
storing the static information into the editable field;
receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range;
creating a record, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device;
adding the static information into the record; and
storing the record in the memory.

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner reasoned similarly to his rejections of independent claims 1 and 7. Much of the applicant's arguments above apply similarly.

First, in the cited portion of the Kabala reference, i.e., col. 4, lines 52-67, there is no description or even a hint of "receiving static information into an editable field" by any one of the transceivers 151-162. Nowhere is there described nor mentioned in the portion cited in Kabala patent of "an editable field" and that the transceiver's own identification codes stored in such an editable field.

Second, claim 17 recites that the editable field is stored in memory "associated with the transceiver device." Nowhere is there disclosed a memory associated with the Kabala transceivers 151-162. Examiner again appeared to have identified the applicant's "memory associated with the transceiver device" with memory associated in the central processor 110 (see Fig. 1) of the Kabala reference, in contradiction of the claim language.

Third, the Examiner argued that "the central processor 110 stores all the collected information from each badge, or each attendee (i.e., storing the static information into the editable field)." This is irrelevant to the claimed step of "storing the static information into the editable field," since it is the wireless transceiver device of the claim preamble which is associated with the steps of claim 17. The Examiner appeared to confuse the Kabala transceivers 151-162 with the separate and distinct central processor 110 again.

Fourth, nowhere is there described nor mentioned that any of the Kabala transceivers 151-162 create "a record, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device." Col. 4, lines 52-67, the portion of the Kabala reference often cited by the Examiner, states:

...transceivers 151 to 162 in each booth receives the identification code of the badge carried by the attendee. The identification information, along with the transceivers' own identification codes, and the signal strength of the signals received from the badges, are forwarded by the transceivers to the central processor 110....Then, the central processor retrieves the information entered by operators when the attendees registered for the show to archive a list having identity of the attendees, the places of booths visited, the times of the visits, and the durations of the visits. Col. 4, lines 52-67.

Fig. 5 is an example of the archival list of records created by the central processor 110. The transceivers 151 to 162 do not generate records with information associated with roaming devices. The transceivers merely forward the information to the central processor 110.

Fifth, assuming *arguendo* that the archival list generated by the central processor 110 is to identified with the applicant's "record associated with the roaming device." The so-called "record" does not include any static input information pertaining to a transceiver device, as called for in claim 17 by the step of "adding the static information into the record." The transceivers' own identification codes do not appear in the archived list. See Fig. 5 of the Kabala patent.

Finally, claim 17 recites the step of "storing the record in the memory," and the Examiner cited col. 5, lines 62-67 of the Kabala patent on this point. Claim 17 recites "memory" in the claimed "method of utilizing a transceiver device." Having identified the applicant's transceiver device with one of Kabala's transceivers 151 to 162 (and presumably the transceivers 181-184 and 191-192 of Fig. 1A), Examiner contradicts himself by identifying the claimed memory with the central processor 110. See Fig. 5. The applicant's "transceiver device," identified as one of the Kabala transceivers 151-162 (and 181-184 and 191-192), is not the same as the central processor 110. Furthermore, the applicant once more points out that the central processor 110 which creates (and presumably stores) the archival list. See col. 5, lines 62-67. The transceivers 151-162 (and 181-184 and 191-192) merely forward the information for the creation of the archival list by the central processor 110. This is not what claim 17 calls for.

Hence independent claim 17 is should be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claims 18-23 depend from claim 17 and therefore should be allowable for at least being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Furthermore, at least some, if not all, of these dependent claims recites additional limitations,

which when considered in light of claim 17, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

3. Claim 24 and its dependents

Independent claim 24 recites:

A method of configuring an access point comprising:
 positioning the access point at a desired location;
 determining an address of the desired location; and
 storing the address in a memory field, the memory field being associated with the access point.

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner found that the step of “determining an address of the desired location” is found in the transceiver's own ID. Here the Examiner appears to have confused the identification of the transceiver and the location of the transceiver. Of course, they are not the same.

Furthermore, claim 24 also recites the step of “storing the address (of the desired location of the access point) in a memory field associated with the access point.” The Kabala reference does not teach of or suggest storing an address of a desired location of a transceiver 181-184 in a memory field associated with any of the transceivers 181-184. The passage of Kabala cited by the Examiner (lines 58-62 of column 5) reads as follows:

“Transceivers 181 to 184 and 190 and 192 wirelessly transmit, preferably in RF, message packets including data relating to ID codes received from badges, signal strengths, and its own ID to a nearby wired transceiver module 171, 172 or 173.”

As previously mentioned, an ID of a transceiver is not an address of a desired location for a transceiver. Further, there is no suggestion that the address of a desired location for a transceiver is stored in the transceiver.

Accordingly, independent claim 24 is not anticipated by the Kabala reference and should be allowable. Claims 25-28 each depend from claim 24 and each of these claims should be allowable over the cited art for at least being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Additionally, at least some, if not all, of these claims recite additional limitations which further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

II. The Examiner Has Not Made A *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness in Rejecting Independent Claim 29

Independent claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Kabala patent in view of the Raviv patent application and further in view of the Stewart patent.

Independent claim 29 recites:

A method for utilizing an access point, the access point having a communications range, the method comprising:
receiving static information into an editable field stored in a memory of the access point, the static information being information pertaining to the access point;
storing the static information into the editable field;
receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range;
registering the roaming device after the indication is received, wherein registering the roaming device includes performing a remote authentication;
creating a record after registering the roaming device, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device;
obtaining the static information from the editable field;
adding the static information into the record; and
storing the record in the memory.

As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 17, the Kabala reference does not teach “receiving static information into an editable field stored in a memory of the access point, the static information being information pertaining to the access point.” Nowhere in the cited portion of the Kabala reference, i.e., col. 5, lines 58-67, is there a description of an editable field in a memory, that the memory belongs to the access point, that the static information is received into the editable field (and hence by the access point), and that the static information pertains to the access point. In the portion cited by the Examiner, the purported static information (transceiver ID) is received by the central processor 110 which is separate and distinct from the purported access point, one of the transceivers 181-184 and 191-192.

There is no teaching in the Kabala reference of “storing the static information into the editable field” since there is no teaching of an editable field.

The Kabala reference does not teach the steps of “creating a record after registering the roaming device, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device; obtaining the static information from the editable field; adding the static information into

the record.” Note that cited Fig. 5 does not show the static information obtained from the editable field, as pointed out earlier.

Finally, the Kabala reference does not teach the step of “storing the record in the memory.” Note that the memory is “of the access point” and cannot be associated with a memory of the central processor 110 which is separate and distinct from the purported access point, one of the one of the transceivers 181-184 and 191-192.

The Examiner acknowledged that Kabala does not disclose step of “registering the roaming device after the indication is received, wherein registering the roaming device includes performing a remote authentication.” But the Examiner argued that at paragraph [0254], the Raviv reference discloses this limitation. Paragraph [0254] discloses that some data services require device authorization before access by a mobile device is permitted, and also mentions mobile device authentication. However, the Raviv patent discloses that a mobile device’s home network is used to identify the mobile device when authentication of the mobile device is requested. The applicant does not find that Raviv teaches an access point performing remote authentication to register a roaming device when the roaming device is within a communications range of the access point. Likewise, the Stewart reference does not overcome this deficiency of Raviv.

Accordingly, independent claim 29 is not obvious over the cited reference and should be allowable.

Conclusion

For the arguments above, it should be evident that the Examiner has not met his burden of providing a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting pending independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 28. The requirements of MPEP §2131, that the cited reference teach every element of the claim, whether expressly or inherently described, have not been met. Likewise, a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting pending independent claim 29 has not been met.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be removed, all pending claims 1-29, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Aka Chan LLP

/Gary T. Aka/

Gary T. Aka
Reg. No. 29,038

Aka Chan LLP
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: (408) 868-4088
Fax: (408) 608-1599

Claims Appendix

Claim 1 (previously presented): A wireless transceiver device, the wireless transceiver device being arranged to interface with a roaming device, the wireless transceiver device comprising:

- computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted;

- a memory arranged to store data, the memory further including an editable field, wherein the computer code for causing the static input information to be accepted causes the static input information to be stored in the editable field;

- computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated, the record being arranged to include the static input information stored in the editable field and the data, wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated further causes the record to be stored on the memory; and

- a processor for executing the computer codes, wherein the memory is further arranged to store the computer codes.

Claim 2 (original): The wireless transceiver device of claim 1 further including computer code for obtaining the data, wherein the data is obtained when the roaming device is in communication with the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 3 (original): The wireless transceiver device of claim 2 wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated includes computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated when the roaming device registers with the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 4 (original): The wireless transceiver device of claim 2 wherein the computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated includes computer code for causing the record associated with the roaming device to be generated when the roaming device deregisters from the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 5 (original): The wireless transceiver device of claim 1 wherein the static input information is a location associated with the wireless transceiver device, and the computer code for causing the static input information to be accepted include computer code for causing the static input information to be accepted from a source that is external to the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 6 (original): The wireless transceiver device of claim 1 wherein the wireless transceiver device is an access point.

Claim 7 (previously presented): A wireless transceiver device, the wireless transceiver device being arranged to interface with a first device, the transceiver device comprising:
means for accepting input information associated with the wireless transceiver device;
means for storing data, the means for storing the data further including means for storing the input information in an editable field, wherein the means for accepting the input information includes means for providing the input information to the editable field; and
means for generating a record associated with the first device, the record being arranged to include the input information stored in the editable field, wherein the means for storing the data further includes means for storing the record.

Claim 8 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 7 further including means for obtaining the data, wherein the data is obtained when the first device is in communication with the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 9 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 8 wherein the means for generating the record include means for generating the record when the first device registers with the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 10 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 8 wherein the means for generating the record include means for generating the record when the first device deregisters from the transceiver wireless device.

Claim 11 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 7 wherein the input information is a location associated with the wireless transceiver device.

Claim 12 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 11 wherein the location includes at least one of a longitude, a latitude, and an altitude associated with the transceiver device.

Claim 13 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 7 wherein the wireless transceiver device is an access point and the first device is a roaming device.

Claim 14 (previously presented): The transceiver wireless device of claim 13 wherein the access point is a part of a wireless local area network, the transceiver wireless device further including:

means for obtaining the data from the first device when the first device is in communication with the transceiver wireless device to access the wireless local area network.

Claim 15 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 14 wherein the means for generating the record associated with the first device includes means for placing the data obtained from the first device in the record and means for placing the input information stored in the editable field in the record.

Claim 16 (previously presented): The wireless transceiver device of claim 15 wherein the means for generating the record further includes means for obtaining the input information from the editable field.

Claim 17 (previously presented): A method for utilizing a transceiver device, the transceiver device being a wireless transceiver device, the transceiver device having a communications range, the method comprising:

receiving static information into an editable field stored in memory associated with the transceiver device, the static information being information pertaining to the transceiver device;

storing the static information into the editable field;

receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range;
creating a record, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device;
adding the static information into the record; and
storing the record in the memory.

Claim 18 (original): The method of claim 17 wherein the static information is received from a source external to the transceiver device.

Claim 19 (original): The method of claim 17 wherein the record is created after the indication that the roaming device is within the communications range is received.

Claim 20 (original): The method of claim 17 wherein adding the static information into the record includes reading the static information from the editable field.

Claim 21 (original): The method of claim 17 wherein the static information is information associated with a location of the transceiver device.

Claim 22 (original): The method of claim 17 wherein the transceiver device is an access point.

Claim 23 (original): The method of claim 17 further including:
obtaining the information associated with the roaming device when the indication that the roaming device is within the communications range is received.

Claim 24 (original): A method of configuring an access point comprising:
positioning the access point at a desired location;
determining an address of the desired location; and
storing the address in a memory field, the memory field being associated with the access point.

Claim 25 (original): The method of claim 24 wherein the address includes at least one of a longitude, a latitude, and an altitude of the desired location.

Claim 26 (original): The method of claim 24 wherein the address is determined using a global positioning system receiver.

Claim 27 (original): The method of claim 24 wherein the memory field is an editable field, and storing the address in the memory field includes:
inputting the address into the access point.

Claim 28 (previously presented): The method of claim 27 wherein inputting the address into the access point includes providing the address to the memory field.

Claim 29 (previously presented): A method for utilizing an access point, the access point having a communications range, the method comprising:

receiving static information into an editable field stored in a memory of the access point, the static information being information pertaining to the access point;

storing the static information into the editable field;

receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range;

registering the roaming device after the indication is received, wherein registering the roaming device includes performing a remote authentication;

creating a record after registering the roaming device, the record being arranged to include information associated with the roaming device;

obtaining the static information from the editable field;

adding the static information into the record; and

storing the record in the memory.

Evidence Appendix

None.

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.